

## REMARKS

Upon entry of the forgoing amendments, claims 2-9, 13-20, 24-31, and 36-43 are pending in this application with claims 2, 13, 24, and 36 being independent claims. No claim is allowed.

Claims 2, 3, 5-9, 13, 14, 16-20, 24, 25, 27-31, and 36-43 have been amended. Claims 2, 13, 24, and 36 have been amended to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 3, 5-9, 13, 14, 16-20, 24, 25, 27-31, 37, and 39-43 have been amended to correct antecedent basis with newly amended claims 2, 13, 24, and 36, respectively. Claim 38 has been amended to correct claim dependency.

Claims 11, 22, 33, and 45 have been newly canceled, without prejudice.

### The 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103 Rejections

Claims 2, 5, 11, 13, 16, 22, 24, 27, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by *Lin et al.* (US 6,751,668 B1). Claims 3, 4, 6-9, 14, 15, 17-20, 25, 26, and 28-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Lin* in view of *Primeaux et al.* (US 6,334,121 B1). Claims 36-43 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Lin* in view of *Prabandham et al.* (US 6,701,438 B1). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Generally, the Office Action states that the prior art discloses or suggests all of the claim elements and limitations. However, the claims have been amended to distinguish elements and limitations that are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Among these is that the updated client HTTP request frequency is based on HTTP "GET" and "POST" requests as claimed. This is as opposed, for example, to *Lin* that only teaches "session establishment requests" (col. 2, lines 29-30), to *Primeaux* that only teaches "command usage patterns" (col. 4, line 7), and to *Prabandham* that only teaches "failed accesses...or...security failures" (col. 4, lines 61-64).

Given this difference, among others, the cited prior art can not be said to anticipate or render obvious the present claims. Thus, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Request for Allowance

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and an early allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

If any matters remain which could be resolved in a telephone interview between the Examiner and the undersigned, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned to expedite resolution of any such matters. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,  
THELEN, REID, & PRIEST LLP



---

David B. Ritchie  
Reg. No. 31,562

Dated: October 15, 2004

Thelen, Reid, & Priest LLP  
P.O. Box 640640  
San Jose, CA 95164-0640  
Tel. (408) 292-5800  
Fax (408) 287-8040